



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,701	02/14/2001	Rong Pan	STFD.009PA	6340
40581	7590	05/03/2005	EXAMINER	
CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC 1270 NORTHLAND DRIVE, SUITE 390 ST. PAUL, MN 55120			NGUYEN, STEVEN H D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2665	
DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/783,701

Applicant(s)

PAN ET AL.

Examiner

Steven HD Nguyen

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All. b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bechtolsheim et al. (US 6,515,963).

Regarding claims 1, 11 and 12, Bechtolsheim discloses detecting a matching flow identification between a recently received incoming packet with at least one packet selected from a set of outgoing packets, and mitigating unbalanced bandwidth allocation due to congestion problem flows by reducing the processing priority of at least one of the selected packet and the recently received packet (col. 9, line 60 - col. 10, line 37). The dropping of a packet of a non adapting aggressive flow (NAF) meets the limitation of reducing the processing priority of that

Art Unit: 2665

packet. Bechtolsheim also discloses using a probability function corresponding to a particular flow in selecting a packet to drop (col. 12, lines 4-14).

Regarding claim 2, Bechtolsheim discloses incrementing a credit field in a flow table for a particular flow each time a packet from that flow is enqueued (col. 10, lines 1:-21).

Bechtolsheim also discloses that the packets are identified as belonging to a particular flow by a flow label in the packet header (col. 6, lines 32-33).

Regarding claim 3, Bechtolsheim discloses quantifying congestion-problem flows, and assigning a processing priority to the quantified congestion-problem flows as a function of the quantification (col. 10, lines 18-64).

Regarding claim 4, Bechtolsheim discloses that for each NAF exceeding the buffer limit, packets will be dropped (col. 10, lines 18-46).

Regarding claims 5, 9 and 10, Bechtolsheim discloses using a probabilistic drop computation (col. 12, lines 4-14). This computation is a function of a particular flow, as well as a function of where the packet is in the queue. Since the new packets in the queue for a particular flow are the packets that would be dropped if the NAF limit were exceeded (col. 10, lines 25-26), the probabilistic decision to drop a packet is based on the packet closest to the back of the queue for a particular flow.

Regarding claim 6, Bechtolsheim discloses no new packets for a NAF exceeding its limit will be enqueued until some are read out (col. 10, lines 38-46). This implies that a plurality of packets all matched to the same flow may exist in the queue.

Regarding claim 7, as stated in the paragraph regarding claims 1, 11 and 12, the dropping of a packet for a particular flow equates to reducing the processing priority for that packet.

Regarding claim 8, as stated above, the newest packet for a NAF is dropped when the NAF reaches its limit.

4. Claims 13-18 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bechtolsheim et al. (US 6,515,963) in view of Silberschatz et al. (US 6,556,578).

Regarding claims 13, 20 and 22, Bechtolsheim discloses all of the limitations (see 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 11 and 12 above for specific references) except that the system is implemented on a server including a CPU. Silberschatz discloses a packet dropping algorithm for achieving a balanced bandwidth allocation in a server, wherein a processor (88) is configured by means of software to manage the transfer and dropping of packets (col. 2, lines 38-47, col. 3, lines 53-64, see also Fig. 1B). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the system of Bechtolsheim in a server including a CPU. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to do this because a server manages many different flows of packets and would need some sort of fair method to balance the allocation of resources to all of the flows.

Regarding claim 14, the server of Silberschatz is intended to serve internet traffic (col. 1, lines 14-36). In addition, Bechtolsheim discloses prioritizing packets relating to a particular flow (col. 13, lines 11-39).

Regarding claims 15-17, Bechtolsheim discloses using a probabilistic drop computation (col. 12, lines 4-14). This computation is a function of a particular flow, as well as a function of where the packet is in the queue. Since the new packets in the queue for a particular flow are the packets that would be dropped if the NAF limit were exceeded (col. 10, lines 25-26), the probabilistic decision to drop a packet is based on the packet closest to the back of the queue for

Art Unit: 2665

a particular flow.

Regarding claim 18, Bechtolsheim discloses a dynamic buffer limiting scheme that avoids the per-flow lookup, setup, and tear down overhead of previous queue-based management systems. The dynamic buffer limit is re-determined on each packet reception, thus avoiding maintaining state for each flow (col. 4, lines 55-67).

Regarding claims 21 and 23, Bechtolsheim discloses that for each NAF exceeding the buffer limit, packets will be dropped (col. 10, lines 18-46).

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bechtolsheim et al. (US 6,515,963) in view of Silberschatz et al. (US 6,556,578) as applied to claims 13-18 and 20-23 above, and further in view of Aweya et al. (US 6,690,645).

Regarding claim 19, Bechtolsheim in view of Silberschatz fails to expressly disclose another communicatively-coupled server that is not adapted to detect a matching flow identification between a recently-received incoming packet with at least one packet selected from a set of outgoing packets. Aweya discloses a network element (14) in a network (10) that is capable of probabilistically dropping packets to reduce congestion (see Figure 1). Aweya also discloses that there may be any number of such network elements (14) connected to the network between a source and a sink (col. 4, line 63 - col. 5, line 3). Thus, in a packet network (10) there may be a plurality of elements communicatively-coupled to each other between a source and a sink. Aweya fails to expressly disclose that one of the communicatively-coupled elements does not have the inventive feature of packet dropping. However, in a large packet network, such as the internet, it is unreasonable to expect every network element, i.e. router, gateway, server etc., for forwarding packets to a sink, or destination, would have to have this inventive feature in

Art Unit: 2665

order for the network element (14) with the inventive feature to be able to send packets to that particular sink. in other words, it is obvious for the network element (14) to be communicatively coupled to an element without the packet dropping feature. At the time the present invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to communicatively couple a server in the invention of Bechtolsheim in view of Silberschatz to a server that did not have the feature of dropping packets from NAFs, which includes the feature of matching recently-received packets with a packet selected from a set of outgoing packets. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to couple the server of Bechtolsheim in view of Silberschatz to a server minus the inventive feature in order to successfully send packets to destinations on the internet served by existing routing devices.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to pages 7-8, the applicant states that Bechtolsheim fails to disclose the step of detecting a matching between the received packet and the packet in the buffer based on the flow identifier and mitigating unbalancing bandwidth allocation etc.. In reply, Bechtolsheim discloses a method and system for matching the flow between the received and transmitting packet "read on detecting a matching flow identification ...", See Fig 3, Ref 332 and 334-335, See col. 5, lines 63 to col. 6, lines 10 discloses a method for identifying if the label of the received packet at input is the same as one of the enqueued packet. and relieving the congestion by processing the packet according per flow dynamic buffer management for dropping the

Art Unit: 2665

packet “read on mitigating ... the received packet” in order to allow the flows has a fair shared of bandwidth allocation and relieved the congestion, See Fig 3, Ref 340 is used to tag a packet for dropping at the input, See fig 9, Ref 930, See col. 10, lines 1-37.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven HD Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3159. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Huy D Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2665

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steven HD Nguyen', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Steven HD Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2665
4/26/05